

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PARK BOARD
HELD AT CITY HALL
MAY 8, 2012
7:00 PM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Steel called the meeting to order at 7:07 pm

II. ROLLCALL

Answering roll call were Members Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto, Weicht, Neville

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, approving the meeting agenda.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried

IV. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert approving the consent agenda as follows:

IV.A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting of Tuesday, April 10, 2012

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

None

VI. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VI.A. Naming of Parks and Facilities Working Group Recommendations

Member Jones went over the “Summary Document” that the working group put together and thanked the Working Group: Member Hulbert, Andy Otness, Bob Kojetin, Ray Giske, David Mesenbourg, Tom Gyump and Rick Ites for their many, many hours of service.

She informed the Park Board that the working group reviewed both naming and donation policies throughout the United States and went through the many different intricacies of their situations that might apply to Edina and reworked them. She indicated that as of the last Friday they received some more comments from the public that she has noted in the blue markup.

Member Jones indicated that there currently is no formal naming policy in the City of Edina and pointed out that the City Council approved the Naming and Donation Working Group after hearing several concerns from residents about the current practice. She added that naming and dedication requests come up several times a year to which staff is currently aware of four naming proposals.

Member Jones stated that after going through the current practice and concerns the working group recommends that the City develop a single naming and dedication policy for all City facilities. She noted they are not recommending that the City rename current facilities to meet specifications in this policy. She pointed out the working group recommends that the Park Board approve the “Naming Dedication Policy” as well as they recommend that the City develop an “Application for Naming and Dedicating Facilities” and a “Petition to the City of Edina” as shown in concept in the Appendix of the policy.

Andy Otness gave the Park Board a summary of the Naming Policy and stated that the City Council has the sole authority for establishing formal names and dedicating any city facilities. She pointed out that facilities are described as anything the City controls: parks, buildings, major features, streets and amenities. She noted the second thing the policy states is that the City Manager's Office will have sole responsibility for keeping a record and managing the naming and dedication process.

Ms. Otness indicated that they also felt what the policy did was set out principles for naming and renaming and dedications and that naming would be reserved for exceptional circumstances. She noted that in their original meetings they had a whole gamut of people who felt things should be restricted or completely open and so that part of the policy represents a collaborative decision.

Ms. Otness informed the Park Board that a lot of the discussions revolved around the naming and renaming for exceptional individuals and the working group decided within the policy that the naming should be based on the contributions to the City rather than the circumstances of their death. Secondly, it was decided there should be a time period after that person has died or ended their relationship with the City to reflect upon an individual's legacy before that naming process would begin. The name of an individual will be considered for a park only if that person has been deceased for 100 years and influenced Edina's history or has naming for him/her as a condition made by the donor of actual land for the park.

Ms. Otness pointed out there is another category of naming besides parks and that is that an individual be considered for a building, major feature or street if that person either was or is currently a resident of Edina, has made a significant contribution over a period of several years to the general public interest and has ended his or her substantive formal relationship with the City or has passed away five years prior to the initiation of a naming process or the name could be considered if it was requested as a restriction of a significant extraordinary major gift to the city like the donation of land.

Ms. Otness pointed out with regards to naming for entities no City facility, except a major feature, shall be named for a business entity as a condition for a donation to the City. This is to minimize the confusion and cost to the City for updating signage and maps. Name of business entities shall be for a fixed period. Names of business entities operating on City property shall be subject to City Council approval and will not require a petition process.

Ms. Otness informed the Park Board that lastly public support for name requests should be demonstrated with a petition process. The working group recommends that the naming and renaming requests require 300 signatures and any dedication requires 100 signatures. In addition, the public and specifically the facilities neighborhood will be informed of a naming request and an opportunity will be provided for their input and comment.

Member Jones thanked Mr. Kojetin for all of his work on compiling the names and donations of all the parks. Mr. Kojetin gave the Park Board a brief history on the compilation report he created. He noted that he thought it would be good to have one central location where a record is kept with the history of the parks and donations where people can go to find this type of information. He noted that he will continue to work on the book as long as he can because there is still a lot more to be added. He noted that most of this information will be stored at the Edina Historical Museum.

Member Segreto indicated that on top of page two of the "Naming and Dedication Policy" where they talk about the philosophy of the City and give an order of preference for naming she feels that each of those categories is really important and is not sure why there needs to be a preference. Member Jones replied they wanted to make sure the order of preference represented something that would first honor maybe a natural place and that's where the geographic location thought connected to it and kind of wanted to make sure they didn't lose sight of the geographic nature of the community before they went

on to more of a people nature of their history which happens to be the events and the people that affect the history. Member Segreto commented that she was very moved by Mr. Kojetin's report and seeing the names of people who have been very important to this community that she would be hard pressed to see that if they were to order preference they would be listed third and therefore would hate to see an order of preference within policy. Member Hulbert replied they came up with what they felt was a kind of a logical order of significance but that isn't to say that geographic location necessarily has to be number one.

Member Segreto indicated that a facility named for an individual who had something happen to their reputation, should have the name changed according to the new guidelines. She stated that puts them into a position of when exactly it should be changed and should that person have the right to clear his or her name in court or in the community. She noted that maybe it would be sufficient to say "The City Council reserves the right to change the name in the event the individual has fallen into disrepute". Member Segreto commented that most of her comments are going to be geared to giving the City Council the discretion and looking to the guidelines to sway them in a direction rather than requiring a name change.

Ms. Otness informed the Park Board that she recalls this discussion came up right after the Joe Paterno events in Ohio. She stated that she is not a "legal person" but knows there is a difference between saying "reserves the right" or "shall" or "may". Therefore, they decided to craft this as they felt at that time and that it would be reviewed by the City attorney for the legal distinction.

Chair Steel suggested the Park Board discuss each page.

Page Three -

Member Segreto asked the working group on the top of the page where it states "to be considered historic a person should be deceased for at least 100 years" how they came up with that number because 100 years seems really, really long to her. Member Hulbert responded they viewed naming parks and land a huge honor and so to have a park renamed for you they wanted there to be some time to reflect, although 100 years might be a little long. Member Deeds commented that he would go with something like 25 years to reflect a little bit.

Member Jones indicated that what it came to actually was what makes something historic is it 100 years, 50 years or 25 years. Member Segreto responded that actually it's not duration that makes it historic, it's what they do and the impact it makes that make it historic. Member Hulbert suggested going with 25 years to which Member Kathryn Peterson replied 25 years is more reasonable. Ms. Otness noted impart was that it would be a legacy that had lasted and maybe that's the language "that will last" because how do you define legacy.

Chair Hulbert noted it seems to be a general consensus 25 years is a good number. Member Segreto commented that she sees "100 years" in the next paragraph "No park shall be named or renamed for an individual unless that individual, was a resident of Edina, has been deceased for at least 100 years . . ." and so her comment would be the same.

Member Segreto indicated in the next paragraph where it reads "The naming and renaming of a building, major feature, or street shall occur no sooner than five years after that person has ended his or her substantive, formal relationship with the City" five years may be too long and she would like to see it cut to three years. She noted that after someone retires or leaves the City there could be some circumstances especially if someone has a health problem. Member Hulbert responded there were some people that felt pretty strongly that it should be until the person was actually deceased but they did all agree there should be some kind of cooling off period. Chair Steel asked how this compares to other cities that were researched to which Member Jones responded in most cities the person needs to be dead. Member Hulbert added that Edina is pretty rare in that they names facilities and buildings after people who are still alive. Member Jones commented that when they first crafted the policy it did say you needed to

have been deceased before anything could be named after you and kept it for months. However, when they reviewed the policy they decided to change it in light of the way Edina deals with their parks which is different than the way other cities do. Member Hulbert commented that he thinks sometimes there is a rush to immediately honor and bestow those people with honors right away. However, in reality we know that three or five years go by quickly and if that award is really merited it will still be there three to five years down the road which gives them a little time to reflect and make sure things are what they thought they were.

Page Four – No changes made

Page Five

Member Segreto asked in regards to the 300 signatures that would be required to start a petition is that what the research bore out in terms of other municipalities? Member Jones replied she believes it is similar to what Denver's policy is. She explained the reason for it is to find out what the level of support and commitment are for the name and they settled on 300 signatures. Member Segreto asked would that mean then if a City Council member wanted to initiate a name change or name something they would have to get 300 signatures. Member Jones replied yes, unless they wanted to go against policy to which that would be noted. Mr. Keprios commented that it's very difficult trying to put a comprehensive policy together because you it will likely be changed in the future but at least it will help by serving as a guideline for the City Council.

Member Deeds noted that to him it seems reasonable to need to have 300 signatures because there does need to be a certain level of interest and support and this puts a barrier up there to make people work a little bit more.

Page Six – No changes made.

Member Jones informed the Park Board that the "application" is just a concept draft and they are not dictating to the City how to write their procedures for internal processing. She noted that she did send it to the City Manager and Assistant City Manager asking for their comments.

Page One – Went back to page one since it was skipped.

Chair Steel thanked everyone for their hard work.

Member Deeds commented that under the major gifts, **page 4**, if they look at the Hornet's Nest proposal is that going to be named the "Hornet's Nest" or are the people who are involved going to be recognized since they are essentially paying one-quarter of the capital costs which is a one million dollar donation. He noted his concern is the policies in this area may be so tight that they eliminate a chunk of flexibility that will allow the City to pursue major gifts. He stated there is a pretty stiff requirement in the policy, (page 4 second #1) stating "Payment of the capital costs for constructing or installing a major feature". To him under #1 it implies 100% of the capital costs. Member Jones responded they should define "major feature" because you are comparing it to a building and there are two definitions in that section. She noted that the paragraph Member Deeds read is the guideline for major features which would include ball fields, swimming pools, playgrounds, etc. Member Deeds pointed out in regards to the Sports Dome they are seeking a gift for the Sports Dome and naming rights for the Sports Dome. He noted it's a three million dollar undertaking so this would imply they would have to raise 1.5 million dollars in order to give the naming rights away and that is his concern. Chair Steel asked Member Jones if she thinks it would be considered a City facility which would be covered under the previous paragraph. Member Jones replied that she would consider the Sports Dome to be a building.

Member Deeds stated for example you have two million dollars' worth of renovations at the ball field and if they were able to get a sponsor who wanted to put in a million dollars, would we give them the name of the ball field. He indicated that yes, he would think he would give them the name of a ball field for one million dollars even if it's not covering the full two million dollars. That is his only concern

with the current wording because it's a pretty tight policy. He suggested changing it to say "a substantial portion" or something like that. Member Jones replied you could change all of #1 under that paragraph to "Payment of a substantial capital cost for constructing and installing". Chair Steel commented that it also helps that it does say "likewise as a guideline but not a limitation". Member Deeds indicated that he just wants to give it as much flexibility as possible. Member Hulbert added that he thinks when it comes to larger items like the "Hornet's Nest" City Council is going to do what they see fit.

Member Dan Peterson indicated that he has thought all along that the naming proposition was a solution in search of a problem and he continues to believe that. He noted that he wants to thank everyone who served on the working group and that he holds the Park Board members most dearly; however, he is going to vote "no" because there is no proof to him that the current system is broken and needs to be fixed. He stated that he has nothing but the highest respect for people who run for public office and the five people who serve on the City Council, current, past and future, are pretty good people and he doesn't want to tie their hands to a policy which has some problems. He commented that he thinks they've done a good job and he doesn't get too concerned in a city of almost 50,000 and only a few people don't like the name of a certain park or pavilion. He noted there is always going to be disagreement and they get past it and move along.

Member Hulbert stated that he agrees, they do have excellent City Council members past and present but situations have occurred in the past that with a lack of policy it would have helped both members of the public and staff as well. Member Deeds responded that he agrees and actually thinks they are doing the City Council a favor, they will still have the decision whether they are going to adopt it or not, but it's a policy and a guideline that they can vote to override anytime they want to. He commented that they are essentially giving City Council the shot to say well, wait a minute we have a policy here, let's think about this and provide some level of rationality and a little more consistency to the process. He stated that he thinks the working group has done a great job on this.

Member Deeds suggested that the information from Mr. Kojetin's booklet be put on the City's website in a searchable form because it would be a great service and so people who are searching for relatives or something will be able to find it. Mr. Keprios replied that's an excellent suggestion and would be a great project for the Historical Society to work on with the Communications Department.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto, that where it states 100 years on page 3 that it be replaced with 25 years.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds, that on page two in the paragraph headed "Renaming City Facilities" that the second paragraph be deleted and that the third paragraph be amended to read "notwithstanding the above, the City Council reserves the right to change the name of any named city facility in order to maintain consistency with the entire policy and flexibility to change the name of a facility named after an individual who has fallen into disrepute and whose name no longer lends honor and dignity to the facility".

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto, that they amend on page four the second #1 to read "Payment of substantial capital costs for constructing and installing a major feature".

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert to approve the Naming and Dedication of City Facilities as amended.

Ayes: Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto

Nays: Dan Peterson

Motion Carried.

VI.B. Donations Policy Working Group Recommendations

Member Jones gave a quick background on donations and noted that currently Edina has two donation policies; one is from 1995 “Donations, Sponsorships and Advertising Policy” and there is also a “Donations and Memorial Policy” that was adopted in the year 2000. She indicated that the City does not currently have citywide written standards for accepting donations or procedures for processing and recording donations. She explained that the working group would like to provide a welcoming and efficient system for uniformly and responsibly accepting, recording and acknowledging donations of money, material, goods and services. She stated that the working group is recommending that the City should replace the two existing donation policies with the proposed donation policy dated April 25, 2012.

Member Jones explained that the working group recommends that the City should develop a citywide uniform donation application and agreement form as well as create new sponsorship and advertising policies. She indicated that they also recommend that the City develop a donations pamphlet showing benches and other items that the City needs in order to make the process of donating easier and welcoming. In addition, they recommend that the City enhance their volunteer programs to increase resident donations of their time and services towards the improvement to the community. Member Jones also pointed out that they recommend that the City should evaluate and enhance the way it recognizes donors of goods and services. The goal of this would be both to encourage and increase donations to the City and to promote citywide consistency.

Member Segreto commented that her biggest concern is that their donation policies not have a “chilling” effect on people who are interested in donating. Member Hulbert replied that currently they don’t think the people in the public really understand what the policy is and how they can make donations. Member Jones noted one of the things they are most excited about is having a list of items of what the City would like in the system whether it’s gazebos, park benches, etc. Member Segreto responded that she agrees and also agrees that they need guidelines; however, as she goes through the guidelines there are a few areas that create a “chill” that she would like to talk about.

Member Segreto pointed out that on page one she would like to see “real estate” included under the definition section of “potential gifts”. Member Jones responded “real estate” is listed on the second page but agrees it would be good to put on page one as well under “Definitions”.

Member Deeds indicated on page one he has a concern on the authority because prior policy states that the City Manager could accept anything up to \$5,000 and now essentially has to act to accept everything. Mr. Keprios replied that now under State Law the City Council must approve all cash, real estate, goods, etc.; however, they do not have to approve volunteer services. Mr. Keprios explained to the Park Board that the \$5,000 was put in there when the policy was created to intentionally start reducing the additional number of plaques in parks and the working group is now recommending that the threshold go up to \$10,000 with the exception of benches.

Member Segreto indicated that on page two when she read the first paragraph it was a little off-putting in the third line where it states “the City is not here to accommodate gifts”, of course the City is not but she doesn’t feel they actually have to say that. She commented that she has the same reaction to some of the language regarding building shrines to donors; it makes her feel uncomfortable and feels “heavy handed”.

Chair Steel responded that she thinks that it is a document that will be read by potential donors so she agrees. Member Deeds noted that he also agrees with “All gifts should be in keeping with the mission, ordinances, philosophy of the policies of the City. The development of public facilities is expected to be the result of careful planning and quality construction”. He noted that he thinks they should take out “Donor recognition should not compete for attention, nor attract attention, etc.” and noted that you don’t want to turn a donor off through this. Member Jones asked Member Deeds if he would delete “City facilities are to be enjoyed and used by all citizens and are not to become shrines to donors, memorialized persons or business entities”. Member Deeds replied he would keep “City facilities are to be enjoyed and used by all citizens”, but he would not do the rest of that. Member Jones asked if he would keep “donor recognition should not compete for attention or attract attention”. Member Deeds replied that he doesn’t think they need to call that out.

Member Segreto commented that in keeping with the same comment she does agree that donations should not be burdensome to the City and she does agree that donors should understand the City’s policy for upkeep and retention. She stated that if they have a good donor contract they could incorporate their concerns in that contract and not have it be in the opening paragraphs that donors will need to read before they make their gift. She noted her recommendation would be to delete in the second paragraph the second and third line and would also recommend deleting the second paragraph and the third line. Chair Steel asked Member Segreto to read it for Park Board’s clarification.

Member Segreto stated that she would delete “acceptance procedures should ensure that donations not become burdensome to the City and that donors understand the City’s policy for upkeep and retention. For donations of material items, all installation, and recognition costs should be included in the cost of the donation”. Member Jones asked if that will be somewhere else in the policy. Member Hulbert commented they should at least make sure that it’s in the contract. Member Jones added that the reason they have this is really to welcome and establish a policy that will be easier than it currently is that was their full intent in welcoming. She noted that if the words are not welcoming she just wants to make sure that the features that they wanted are in the policy and as she looks at that she thinks those things are written up in the guidelines. Member Segreto stated that if this is in the contract then when there is a donor, especially a significant donor they could sit down with the City and probably negotiate some of these items and so put it in the contract and then it’s there to be discussed rather than in the opening two paragraphs.

Member Segreto indicated that on number three page three it says “the donation covers the full costs for purchase, recognition, installation and required maintenance during the expected life span of the feature that”, has a much more positive tone. Chair Steel asked Member Segreto if she would like to make a motion for the lines she would like to see deleted on page two.

Member Hulbert asked Member Segreto those are the lines you wanted you stopped at “should be included with the cost of the donation”, what about the next sentence where it says “the city reserves the right to charge maintenance costs”, Member Segreto replied that she would leave the “city reserves the right to charge maintenance costs”, that’s for maintenance or repair costs.

Member Segreto added where it states “The City should not become burdened by pledged gifts that are not obtained” she doesn’t think they have to say they were “burdened” but rather should say “pledges should not be considered donations” and leave it at that. Member Hulbert responded that he thinks that was more in line with gifts because he has heard of stories of people just donating items to the City that the City doesn’t even need.

Member Deeds commented that the line they are referring to is simply talking about people that pledge and then never fulfill that pledge and so he thinks they only have to say “it should not be considered donations”.

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, to recommend that on page two in the second paragraph the second line reading “acceptance procedures should ensure that donations not become burdensome to the City and that donors understand the City’s policy for upkeep and retention” be deleted. Additionally, the third line in that same paragraph reading “for donations of material items all installation and recognition costs should be included with the cost of donation” should be deleted. In that same paragraph the sentence beginning “the City should not become burdened by pledged gifts that are not obtained and therefore” be deleted and a period inserted. The line will then go on to read “Pledges should not be considered donations”.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Chair Steel informed Member Segreto she is going to bump her up to the first paragraph if you want to do the same because she had deleted a third line “not to accommodate gifts” and then started with deletion on the fourth line “and are not to become shrines” and deleted the renaming of that paragraph.

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, to recommend in the first paragraph third line, delete the words “not to accommodate gifts”. In the fourth line of that same paragraph delete “and are not to become shrines to donors, memorialized persons or business entities”. Delete the next sentence “donor recognition should not compete for attention or attract attention away from the purpose for which the facility was created”.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Chair Steel asked Member Segreto to do a quick motion on the first page about real estate.

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds, to recommend on page one in the definition section that “real estate” be inserted anywhere in the definition of gifts.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Page 2 other items

Member Segreto noted that at the bottom of the page #1 it says “The donation shall meet a true need for the City” and stated that she thinks it’s hard to understand what “true need” means so instead say “The donation shall be in the best interest of the City”. Member Hulbert replied that he thinks it accomplishes the same thing. Member Deeds noted that he questions, given that the City Council has to accept all donations anyway and vote on them, do they even need that line in there. Mr. Keprios pointed out that the City Council doesn’t have to accept all proposed donations, they can reject whichever ones they choose. Member Deeds responded he means do they need that first line in there because in that case they are going to review them all anyway, particularly major donations, as to whether they meet the needs of the City. Member Hulbert replied that maybe it will let people know so that it doesn’t come as a surprise to them. Member Jones stated that she thinks Member Segreto’s wording was friendlier and their intent is to be welcoming. Member Jones pointed out that what they were trying to get at with the wording was what if someone has created something and wants to give it to the City but the City has no place for it and doesn’t really want to accept it then the City Council would have a reason to say “no”. Member Segreto commented that she agrees and maybe it should say “the donation shall be in the best interest of the City” and just leave it at that.

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, to amend on page two the paragraph numbered #1, that the language be deleted and substitute language that reads “the donation shall be in the best interest of the City” inserted in its place.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Page Three –

Member Segreto indicated that she would like to see number three say “The City shall consider the costs of the installation and if required maintenance” rather than “The donation shall cover the full costs”.

Member Jones responded that she understands Member Segreto is trying to be a little more lenient but this piece is about what the actual donation should cover. Member Segreto suggested saying “The City shall consider all costs associated with the gift”. Member Jones pointed out that she is talking about when they fill out that donation form what they are talking about is what the total donation should be and there’s a calculation there. Member Segreto commented that is why she thinks they need to be real clear in the contract that the City will not ensure that a tree will be around in that location in perpetuity and that the City will not be held responsible for replacement. Member Hulbert commented that he sees what Member Segreto is saying but he doesn’t read #3 as being really negative but rather thinks it’s just being clear in explaining what is expected along with the gift. Chair Steel asked Member Segreto if she would like to make a motion to which Member Segreto replied no.

Member Segreto indicated that she would delete #5, #6 and #7. Member Hulbert asked her why she would want to delete them. Member Segreto replied again because to her it’s “chilling”. In #7 where it reads “The donation does not require the purchase of a burdensome amount of additional items in order for it to be useful” seems “chilling” they either accept it or not because she has full faith in staff and City Council about whether or not we should accept something we can’t take care of.

Chair Steel stated that to her it seems to conflict a little with #3 and therefore maybe they need to beef up #3. Member Deeds noted that because they have #3 he doesn’t think they need #5, #6 or #7 to which Member Segreto noted she would be fine with that. Chair Steel asked the Park Board if there were suggestions of anything they should add to #3. Ms. Otness informed the Park Board that when they went to compile this they used all of the suggestions and comments that came to the working group and so they decided as a group to put it in as they received those suggestions or comments and so that is where the language came in, it wasn’t intended to be “chilling”. Members Deeds suggested for #3 they could put “. . . and require repair and maintenance during the expected life” which takes out one of the #5, #6 or #7.

Ms. Otness informed the Park Board that when they went to compile this they used all of the suggestions and comments they received and so for some of those they actually put in the language that they received and that is where some of the language came in. It wasn’t intended to be “chilling”, they wanted to include what they received.

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, to recommend on page three that #3 shall be deleted in its entirety and substituted with the following: “The City shall consider all costs associated with the gift including but not limited to the full cost for the purchase, recognition, installation (if required) repair and maintenance during the expected life span of the feature”.

Member Jones commented that she liked it with the exception she would like to switch to “The donation” instead of “City considers”.

Member Jones made an amendment to the motion, seconded by Member Segreto, to recommend that instead of beginning the sentence with “The City shall consider to “The donation should cover” and then follow it with what Member Segreto said.

Ayes to Amendment: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Ayes to Motion: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, recommending striking #5, #6 and #7 on page three.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto, to strike #15.

Member Jones asked she is just curious as to why you don't want #15 in there. Member Deeds replied the wording in terms of "creating a shrine" that if they are going to do that he likes the wording from the paragraph they took out which said "donor recognition should not interfere with the use, etc." . He stated that if the Park Board thinks that is covered by #9 then they do not need to worry about it, they just have it in the one. Member Jones commented that this is actually "the public should refrain from creating a shrine" it doesn't have to do with a donation as it does with having people deposit flowers or other things at a City amenity. Member Deeds commented that is appropriate then for guidelines for donations, if that's a whole different issue. It is not part of the guidelines for a donation. Member Kathryn Peterson commented that it's not really in their control anyway.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Member Deeds indicated on #17 he thinks it's difficult to name things you don't want to have happen and thinks if it were a general statement such as "donations and sponsorships will be gratefully accepted as long as they do not challenge the public sense of common decency and good taste". He commented that they need to support their local businesses and it's very difficult to say these things aren't good because there could be other things that could come up so just stick with common decency and good taste. Chair Steel asked if #17 is redundant with #1 that says "The donation should be in the best interest of the City" to which Member Deeds replied he also thinks that covers it.

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, to delete #17.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Member Segreto indicated that #8 states "The donation does not present a real or perceived conflict of interest for the City or its employees" and she is okay with "conflict of interest" but she is not so sure about "perceive". Member Jones replied that was actually a request by Karen Kurt, Assistant City Manager, and is not sure why she wanted to insert "real" or "perceived" but has a feeling it's because it gives the City the opportunity to decline a donation.

Page Four -

Chair Steel asked how you define "large scale" donation. Member Jones replied they didn't define it and that is one of those areas that as you write the policy you try to give some flexibility to the City Council and boards. She commented if you think it needs to be defined she would be open to discuss and define it. She added that originally they did not have "large scale" in the policy and it seemed as if they were creating record keeping and all sorts of unnecessary bureaucracy.

Page Five -

Member Deeds indicated he is curious about the blue section because it would seem to him that naming ball fields after people is kind of traditional. Actually, in a lot of cities for somebody who has been instrumental in one of the leagues or something for years and who has put in a lot of energy and effort in a field is named after them. Member Jones responded that came up because people had mentioned that they felt that walking through a park should not feel like walking through a cemetery and they were

concerned about memorial plaques being in places where they don't expect to have people think about somebody's loss and so that's why that was included in here.

Member Segreto commented that she sort of agrees with Member Deeds that it seems logical that our athletic facilities would naturally follow the names of people who have been very successful in a sport. Member Hulbert noted that there is concern about how memorials are displayed. Member Deeds stated that they have City personnel who are responsible for approving the installation of donations and memorials. Member Hulbert commented that the concern is more the construction and placement of memorials more so than naming of fields.

Member Jones commented that she does understand that's what most people do when people donate frequently and it's because someone has passed away. She noted that she would like to hear more discussion on it because as she stated earlier everything written in "blue" just came in last week and has not been discussed as a working group. She indicated that she didn't want to disregard someone who has taken the time to comment on the policy.

Chair Steel asked Member Jones so donations could be made for living people in these areas to which she replied correct. Chair Steel asked what would be the difference in appearance between the donations versus the memorials. Member Jones explained there would possibly be this is "in memory of". Chair Steel noted it would be the text, correct but you would still see a plaque walking by, right, in either case at first glance when you are walking through the park. Member Jacobson commented that she personally doesn't think they need that statement at all.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Jones, strike the statement in blue under "Installation" that begins with "potential sites for donations . . ." on page five.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Page Six –

Mr. Keprios noted that one of the things he would like the Park Board to consider in looking at the adoption of this policy is how many plaques are enough for a park and is it possible to have too many plaques and at what point does it interfere with the real purpose of the park. He pointed out that the proposed language permits memorial plaques on all park benches. He commented that as the Park Board is coming up with a policy to recommend to the City Council, he asked the Park Board to think about the park experience; what is a park and how and what do you want a visitor of a park to feel during their experience in the park. Member Hulbert responded that he thinks they would all agree that there can be too many.

Member Hulbert indicated that the working group wants to have uniformity of sizing of plaques and the way the benches look so there is symmetry throughout the park system. He noted that he thinks they agreed they didn't feel it was necessary to put a plaque on a tree that someone donated. He noted the simple acknowledgment of a donated tree could maybe put on an online registry for certain things like trees and try to keep the park experience about enjoying the park and not always about being a shrine or a memorial. He added that as the community ages there are going to be more requests every day.

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that often times when a donation is offered, the plaque is clearly more important to the donor than the proposed new park amenity. Do we really want every park bench in the entire park system to have a plaque on it that states "In Memory Of"? Mr. Keprios noted that he is curious how the working group decided that it is okay to have those plaques on all benches but no other similar amenities of equal value such as picnic tables or water fountains. Ms. Otness replied she didn't think their discussion was as detailed as that. She indicated that they were thinking most people who would like to donate an amenity to the park are mostly interested in donating benches and they were

not necessarily aware of requests for anything else. Mr. Keprios responded that the way he reads it is if you donate a bench you get a plaque but anything other than that has to be \$10,000 or greater. Member Jones pointed out they currently have many plaques less than \$5,000 as compilation boards and so the difference is that yes, you can be recognized on a board with other donors and that is consistent with what is part of the current policy. Mr. Keprios asked Member Jones to explain what that means. Member Jones explained that there is a recognition board at the Edina Senior Center as well as there are other types of recognition boards throughout the Parks System where people's names are listed. For example, Fox Meadow Park listed the donors of that park. She noted that currently they have this as a policy and noted that in the beginning they recommended that the City come up with consistency and a policy for recognition and really didn't want to get into too many details in the policy. She stated that she does think they could as a City look at the policy of recognizing the donors in a more consistent fashion and they don't want their parks totally filled up with signs. Member Hulbert suggested saying something like "donation of recognition items follow the following criteria" and then come up with a definition sometime at a later date as to what a recognition item is with the help of staff. He asked as a Park Board do they want it to include water fountains, park benches, gazebos, etc. Chair Steel commented that it looks like the last line of page six states "Recognition for tree donations shall be at the discretion of the Director of Parks . . .".

Member Deeds stated that he doesn't think at this level they can establish that level of detail in a policy unless they want to go through and say how many plaques will be at each park. He noted on page five under "Installation" it states "City personnel shall be responsible for approving the installation of donations" which means you have the right or somebody in your office has the right to say you know you may want it in that park but we have 47 plaques in that park right now and so we are not going to install it there. Mr. Keprios replied that he would not want this director or the next director to be burdened with this discretion because it opens the door to a perception of favoritism where we simply have to be fair and consistent. Member Deeds asked do they do a certain number of plaques per acre because they have a lot of different parks with a lot of different sizes and with a blanket policy given the diversity of what they are talking about doesn't make sense.

Mr. Keprios explained the main reason he established the existing policy in the first place is because he felt there were too many plaques in the parks and so he made it simple. A donor needed to cross that \$5,000 threshold and the current policy accomplished that. For \$5,000 you could get a bench but there are not too many people willing to give \$5,000 for a bench that only costs \$400.00; however, for many people if they can't have a plaque they won't donate.

Chair Steel asked Mr. Keprios if he would recommend that they make a statement on preserving the integrity of the park or get rid of the bench section or both. Mr. Keprios replied that he thinks the policy that has been in place with the \$5,000 threshold works, the intent was to limit more and more plaques.

Member Jacobson indicated that on page three #9 it says "the donation shall not interfere with the intended current or future use of the facility" but rather say "the donation should not interfere or detract from. . ." that really is supporting what you want with the word "detract". Mr. Keprios replied again that it should not be at the discretion of the Parks Director, it should be consistent.

Member Jones stated there are a couple of issues being raised. First is the concern over plaques on park benches and noted that there are some parks that allow plaques on benches but not on the part that you see as you approach the bench but rather on the backside. She noted that could be a policy because she thinks park benches are going to be something that we really want to encourage and welcome donations as the City approves its "Living Streets Policy". As the "Living Streets Policy" gets funded the City will be looking for additional park benches.

Member Hulbert suggested changing it from "The City may recognize donors who have donated \$10,000" to "The City may recognize donors who have donated \$5,000". Member Jones pointed out

that goes in the opposite direction of the point you were making. Mr. Keprios stated that the \$5,000 threshold works because they still get donations. Member Hulbert indicated that if you drop it down to \$5,000 and take in the following paragraph that says “donations and benches shall be recognized according to the final criteria . . .”

Member Deeds suggested taking “park bench” out and keep the \$5,000 in. He noted they need to make an initiative separately and suggested they put out a map where all of the benches are that the City would like to have and put them up for bid starting at \$400. He commented that he doesn’t mind every bench being named they can start an auction for the benches in terms of where they are located and how many they want. He noted they could start a “sponsor a bench” or “buy a bench” program and raise money and put it on the City’s website talking about the program and leave it open for auction and see what they get. Mr. Keprios asked Member Deeds if he is suggesting they get a plaque on the bench to which Member Deeds replied he doesn’t see any problem with having plaques on every bench in the City if it gets sponsored. He commented that in terms of having plaques on the ground and other places yes, he thinks you are right that is much more problematic and that is where the \$5,000 kind of hurdle comes in.

Chair Steel noted that she likes Member Deeds approach but wouldn’t this policy prohibit a bidding program like that if it didn’t get to the \$5,000 mark. Member Deeds commented he thinks if they take the stuff out about the benches and it just says for a plaque which it doesn’t.

Member Jones indicated the next paragraph states “Donors of benches shall be recognized according to the following criteria: standard recognition plaques shall be used on donated benches to promote consistency in cost, size, type and mounting with plaque language approved by the City. Bench plaques shall be a maximum of 3 inches high by 6 inches wide”. Member Jones commented that she thinks it works within this policy. She noted what she is hearing is some reluctance about the language of \$10,000. She commented that she doesn’t know how the Park Board feels about the third paragraph and would like to hear their comments.

Member Hulbert noted that he thinks the bidding process sounds a little bit complicated in how they would coordinate it and thinks they should just change it from \$10,000 to \$5,000. He also pointed out that he thinks 3 inches by 6 inches is bigger than what the working group had talked about and thought they had talked about small discreet plaques and not something you could read from 20 feet away. Member Deeds commented that he thinks 3x6 is fine to which Member Jones replied it’s a maximum of 3x6 but that she would happy to make it smaller.

Member Jones proposed to keep the bench paragraph and would be curious to hear if somebody wants to speak to the third paragraph. Member Deeds asked Mr. Keprios if he is suggesting that \$10,000 is too high and would he like to keep it at \$5,000. Mr. Keprios responded that he would recommend it but that \$10,000 would certainly further reduce the number of additional plaques and donations in the future. Member Jones replied that if he thinks it will reduce the number of donations that is not what her intent was for writing the policy. She pointed out that the current policy has recognition on a board with ranges of donations with your name among other donors; however, that board was never built so what they are doing is changing the current policy which would put people’s names on a compilation board centrally located to allow individual plaques. She noted that her thinking was they don’t really want that many plaques all over the parks and so if they are not going to be putting a name on a compilation board but are going to allow individual plaques then they should raise the donation amount. Therefore, that was her logic if you want to suggest that they create an actual compilation board so that people could donate and have their name for a \$5,000 donation then maybe that would be another way to get around it.

Member Deeds commented that whether it’s \$5,000 or \$10,000 is it being suggested that somewhere in every park they could have something that would have a sign on it listing the big donors, is that what they are potentially trying to do? Member Jones replied that the original policy that they are rewriting

had that wording in it and had one board centrally located and not one in each of the parks. Mr. Keprios explained the concept was to make it look like a challenge and when people walked in to City Hall they would see the board; however, after the new City Hall was built, they were told that there was no wall space available in the new building to attach a donations board onto and so it never happened.

Member Jones pointed out that they need to keep in mind that this is a citywide policy and so they want to make sure that they don't craft it specific to parks so this would be similar to if someone were donating to the Police or Fire Department, etc.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto, to change it from \$10,000 back to \$5,000.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto

Motion Carried.

Member Hulbert noted again that 3x6 inches is really large and it's going to be first thing you notice when you see that bench and therefore would like to talk about moving it or having it be at the discretion of staff so that there is consistency in plaque size. Member Jones suggested to Member Hulbert to propose that the paragraph include a wording something like "smaller than or as small as possible". Member Deeds stated that he doesn't see what the problem is with having it 3x6 it's large enough for people to read he doesn't see what's wrong with having somebody say "In Memory of Joe Smith" and it being a 3x6 versus it being on 1x2. Member Segreto stated that even if the plaques are on the backs of the benches, especially those that are surrounding a lake facing toward the lake, if you are a runner and you are running on the path it can be really distracting so she disagrees.

Member Jones commented that she agrees they should be as small as possible. Member Hulbert replied that it doesn't have to be as small as possible but he has seen some plaques out there that are no more than about 4 square inches. Chair Steel asked is there a suggestion on the size of the plaque?

Member Hulbert made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds to have the plaques be 6 square inches.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto

Motion Carried.

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds, to approve the policy as amended.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto

Motion Carried.

VI.C. Veteran's Memorial Sculptor Contract

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board they are not as far along as he had hoped but between pledges, in-kind donations and cash they are at approximately \$170,000. He proposed to the Park Board that they recommend to the City Council to allow them to sign off on a contract with the sculptor once they have exceeded \$100,000 cash in the bank. He commented that they are not going to allow a shovel in the ground until they have all of the money and in-kind committed. He noted that the reason for this is unfortunately the sculptor needs nine months to build it.

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds, for approval of that.

Member Segreto asked are they making a motion to approve the contract to which Mr. Keprios replied yes under those conditions. Member Segreto noted that there were three issues that she brought up at the last meeting that have not been incorporated in the contract and she believes the discussion was that everyone thought they were sort of important.

Member Segreto made an amendment to the motion, seconded by Member Deeds, to add a paragraph for delivery date, the sculpture shall be completed and delivered to the City on or before and we could put a blank there but the City should put an outside delivery date. On the second page of the contract at the bottom of the venue for disputes right now the dispute venue is stated to be Essex County New York and she would like that to read Hennepin County Minnesota and that the prevailing party should be entitled in addition to such relief as may be granted to a reasonable sum for out-of-pocket expenses, arbitration fees, and all the rest that is written in that sentence. She is adding out-of-pocket expenses and arbitration fees.

Member Deeds asked if this contract has been reviewed by the City attorney to which Mr. Keprios replied he intends to do that. Member Deeds suggested they defer until reviewed by the City attorney. Mr. Keprios noted that he will forward Member Segreto's recommendations to the City attorney to look at.

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, that regarding the copyright that the sculptor will retain the copy to the sculpture except that the City shall have the right to use images of the sculpture for the purposes of fundraising and promoting the Veteran's Memorial and also to use the images of the sculpture in city publications.

Member Jones stated that she thinks this issue was brought up before about the fact that while we have the funding for the sculpture we don't yet have funding for the installation of the patio and courtyard where this is going to be placed and would like the Park Board to have a discussion about how everyone feels about committing themselves to this. She pointed out that "Donation Policy" allows for the City to contract for these types of things but it needs to go through the City Council so that City Council realizes where we are on that contract and what we are suggesting. Therefore, she would go by what they just passed which is to say this needs to go to City Council. She added that she would word it more to make suggestions to our policy which requires approval of City Council with the amount needed to complete the project clearly stated and available in the budget. Mr. Keprios noted so that would be \$400,000 to which Member Jones replied yes, that would be part of the statement going to City Council that if we want to approve of this that the City does have the funds to cover this in case we don't.

Member Hulbert noted that at this point they are only approving the construction and installation of the sculpture if they secure the financing for that, which is what they are requiring that they do. He stated at this point he is comfortable knowing that it's a commitment to the funds, not just a pledge to the funds.

Chair Steel commented that they have an amendment to be voted on and then this sounds like a more general discussion. Member Jones noted that it's just a discussion at this point, she is not adding an amendment she is just clarifying a statement.

Chair Steel stated let's vote on the amendment first and then continue on.

All in favor of Member Segreto's amendments:

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

Member Deeds suggested that they further recommend that the contract not be signed until there is \$100,000 of the \$400,000 total needed in the Edina Foundation and so the \$400,000 is stated clearly there for the City Council.

Member Deeds proposed an amendment to the motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, that in the line that reads "I further recommend that the contract not be signed until there is a minimum of \$100,000 in the Edina Community Foundation Veteran's Memorial account" be changed to read "Until there is a minimum of \$100,000 of the \$400,000 needed in the Edina Community Foundation's Veteran's Memorial account".

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

All in favor of the motion:

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

VI.D. Reschedule November Park Board Meeting

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board under the new “Religious Holiday Policy” because the November Park Board meeting falls on the third day of Diwali of the Hindu religion they will need to find an alternate date for their November Park Board meeting.

Member Segreto asked for the Park Board members who may not be able to attend on a different date will that affect their attendance because she feels they make a commitment to serve on a certain date and to the extent that they start moving this date around she thinks that the move date should not be counted in their attendance requirement. Mr. Keprios replied he doesn’t disagree and thinks that a recommendation should be brought to the City Council if you establish November 19th as the date for the November Park Board meeting and that it doesn’t count against your attendance record of 75%. Chair Steel pointed out that if you run into canceled meetings you are kind of running the risk of not being able to make up for it so it goes both ways. Chair Steel added that if members are not able to attend a Park Board meeting she will ask them to weigh in if they know it’s on the agenda and they can’t vote on it.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, to accept November 19th as the new meeting date.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Deeds, Segreto
Motion Carried.

VII. Correspondence and Petitions

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that he is still periodically receiving emails that continue to be added to the master list for both the Hornet’s Nest and the Edinborough Park Study. He noted he will continue to periodically forward those emails on.

VIII. Chair and Board Member Comments

Member Hulbert noted that they had some soccer games at the Braemar Soccer field and all of the parents were raving over the condition of the field.

Member Kathryn Peterson informed the Park Board there was an article in the online Star Tribune regarding the Hornet’s Nest which she sent to Mr. Keprios so he could send the link to the Park Board members.

Member Jones asked if there is any word about the Golf Dome or Sports Dome. Mr. Keprios responded that they expect to see a full report in the next day on the Sports Dome and he thinks that the preliminary results show that it’s possible but extremely expensive and more than likely not feasible to even just have a sports dome and clearly there is not enough room for a combination sports dome and golf dome. He noted that it looks like the direction they are going to have to head is to rebuild the golf dome in its current location. He noted that it makes the most sense financially and if they don’t end up putting in a sports dome at the Braemar site next to the Gun Range they are going to have to go to Plan B. Member Kathryn Peterson asked will they have an opportunity to have a discussion around the results of their findings to which Mr. Keprios replied he would hope so, yes.

Member Deeds asked is the Sports Dome Working Committee now done. Ms. Kattreh replied that she doesn’t think they can say that officially.

IX. Staff Comments

Mr. Keprios asked the Park Board to look at the Gallagher Drive roadway improvement packet that he handed out. He noted the packet is what the City Engineer, Wayne Houle, presented to the City Council. He pointed out that it includes one of the first sections they are going to develop knowing that the Nine Mile Trail is coming their way and that it would significantly narrow Gallagher Drive in order to make room for a 10 foot wide path on the east side of Gallagher Drive between West of France and north of Parklawn. Mr. Keprios stated that Three Rivers Park would pay for approximately \$125,000 of that.

Member Hulbert asked if they are doing some work in that area is there anything that the golf management would like to do to improve the signage to bring more visibility to Fred Richards Golf Course. Mr. Keprios replied they could certainly ask and asked Member Hulbert what he might have in mind. Member Hulbert replied he doesn't have anything in mind but he has heard people say it's kind of hard to find to which Mr. Keprios agreed, it's a tough location. Mr. Keprios explained that they have to abide by their own sign ordinance so they are limited that one sign you see is what you get.

Chair Steel asked as the Nine Mile Creek project goes forward what is the Park Board's role as little segments are decided. She commented that she knows the Transportation Commission weighed in and wondered if they are going to be asked to weigh in on certain sections. Mr. Keprios replied that the Park Board will get to weigh in when there are decisions to be made of any alternations of route but he thinks the Park Board has already given a recommendation and approved a route and this has not deterred from that. However, if there is something that is different from what you've already recommended it would come back to the Park Board. He stated that he thinks the next step will be that Three Rivers has to secure some federal grant money which isn't expected until about 2014.

Mr. Keprios updated the Park Board that the City Council approved the Park Board's recommendations regarding the proposed Hornet's Nest project. The first meeting with our attorney is scheduled for tomorrow to talk about a memorandum of understanding and begin the process of figuring out the details of how the project will be designed and built.

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that the City Council approved your recommendation on the "Aquatic Center Priority Use Policy". He noted that the policy stayed pretty much the same, which states a 75% residency requirement for the Edina Swim Club.

Chair Steel commented that she wanted to add she pulled the User Fee's Working Group recommendations from tonight's agenda.

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that they had to delay the Edinborough Park Study and that it will be in the Park Board's June 12th agenda along with the Working Group recommendation.

Mr. Keprios asked the Park Board if they would like to hear from Kevin Staunton on the Grandview project next month to which Chair Steel replied she thinks they should probably wait on that.

Mr. Keprios showed the Park Board and went over the proposed master plan for Countryside Park. He commented that he was told that the chances of the Waters Development happening is 50/50 at best but he still thinks it's going to happen someday. He pointed out that the Countryside Park master plan has some minor changes; however, he would still like to run it by the Countryside Park Neighborhood Group and the Park Board for input. Therefore, if you have any thoughts on this he would appreciate it either by a phone call or email.

Meeting adjourned at 9:52 pm.